

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/926,366	KONIGER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	D. Lawrence Tarazano	1773

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) D. Lawrence Tarazano. (3) _____.
 (2) Corwin Umbach. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 24 April 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-16.

Identification of prior art discussed: Moen et al. (6,380,279).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's Signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner stated that the 112 second paragraph rejection could be over come by including the limitations of claim 6 in to the independent claims.

The examiner stated that claim 13 should have been included in the rejection of the claims (claim 14 which was rejected depends from claim 13).

Claim 11 would be deemed allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of claims 1 and 6.

The examiner stated that "the use claims" would need to be corrected.

